

Application No. 09/749,084
Response to Final Office Action

Customer No. 01933

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

THE CLAIMS

Claims 30, 37 and 39 have been amended to delete the unnecessary limitation of the "means for displaying."

Clearly no new matter has been added, and clearly no new issues have been raised which require further consideration on the merits and/or a new search.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the amendments to the claims be approved and entered under 37 CFR 1.116.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 21-24, 29-33 and 39 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by *Mastering Microsoft Office 97 Professional Edition* (previously cited "Moseley et al"); claims 25-28 and 34-38 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of Moseley et al with various ones of USP 5,276,795 (previously cited "Hoeber"), USP 6,583,797 (previously cited "Roth"), *Microsoft Word 2000* (previously cited "MS Word"), USP 5,781,192 (previously cited "Kodimer"), "Google Groups" (newly cited

Application No. 09/749,084
Response to Final Office Action

Customer No. 01933

"Tim"), and *The Mac Observer* (newly cited "Jalby"). These rejections, however, are respectfully traversed.

According to the present invention as recited in independent method claim 21 and corresponding independent apparatus claim 30, a data transfer method and apparatus are provided which comprise specifying a range of a displayed operation target with an input device; performing a single event to transfer the specified range of the operation target; judging whether coordinates of an input pointer of the input device, when the single event is performed, are within the specified range of the operation target; and transferring data within the specified range of the operation target to a transfer destination when the coordinates are judged to be within the specified range.

Similarly, according to the present invention as recited in independent claim 37, a data transfer system is provided whereby data within a specified range of an operation target is transferred to a retrieve server via a browser when the coordinates of a displayed component are judged to be within the specified range.

And similarly, according to the present invention as recited in independent claim 39, a data transfer device is provided whereby data within a specified range of an operation target and data indicating a web address of the data within the specified

Application No. 09/749,084
Response to Final Office Action

Customer No. 01933

range of the operation target are both transferred to an editor when the coordinates of a displayed component are judged to be within the specified range.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Moseley et al (Microsoft Office 97) discloses the features of the claimed present invention whereby a range of data is selected, a single event is performed, and the selected data transferred if coordinates of an input pointer are within the specified range when the single even is performed.

It is respectfully pointed out, however, that the features of Moseley et al referred to by the Examiner are arbitrarily selected and unrelated steps of different copy and paste methods. For example, the Examiner has pointed to steps 1 and 2 of the keyboard command copy and paste method of Moseley et al as corresponding to the "specifying" and "performing" steps of claim 21. But the Examiner refers to steps 2-4 of the shortcut menu method of Moseley et al as corresponding to the "judging" and "transferring" steps of claim 21. These are clearly unrelated steps of different copy and paste methods.

It is respectfully submitted that Moseley et al does not disclose, teach or suggest that the keyboard command and shortcut menu methods thereof may be combined, and it is respectfully pointed out that the Examiner has not provided any reasoning to

Application No. 09/749,084
Response to Final Office Action

Customer No. 01933

suggest that steps 1 and 2 of the keyboard command method are combinable with steps 2-4 of the shortcut menu method to form a single method corresponding to the present invention as recited in claims 21, 30, 37 and 39.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that even if the keyboard command and shortcut menu methods of Moseley et al were merged in the manner suggested by the Examiner, no logical copy and paste method would result. In fact, the method suggested by the Examiner as corresponding to the claim 21 includes highlighting text, pressing "Ctrl+C" or "Ctrl+X" to copy or cut text, then determining whether the pointer is on the selected text and right clicking, choosing "Copy" or "Cut" from the shortcut menu to copy or cut the selected text, and finally moving the pointer and choosing paste from the shortcut menu to paste the text.

Thus, the method suggested by the Examiner as corresponding to the claimed present invention in fact includes selecting text and copying it twice. Indeed, as asserted by the Examiner on page 10 of the Office Action, according to Moseley et al, pressing "Ctrl+C" copies selected text to the clipboard. And it is respectfully submitted that there would be no logical reason to further follow steps 2-4 fo the shortcut menu copy and paste

Application No. 09/749,084
Response to Final Office Action

Customer No. 01933

method of Mosely et al to again copy text that has already been copied by pressing "Ctrl+C."

Still further, it is respectfully submitted that even if the two copy/cut and paste methods of Moseley et al were combinable, the features of the present invention whereby it is judged whether coordinates of an input pointer of the input device, when the single event is performed, are within the specified range of the operation target still would not be achieved.

That is, it is respectfully submitted that Moseley et al clearly does not disclose judging whether the coordinates of the input pointer are within the specified range, when "Ctrl+C" (which the Examiner asserts corresponds to the single event of the present invention) is pressed. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Moseley et al does not disclose, teach or suggest judging whether coordinates of an input pointer of the input device, when the single event is performed, are within the specified range of the operation target, as according to the present invention as recited in independent method claim 21 (and apparatus claims 30, 37 and 39).

Yet still further, it is respectfully submitted that since Mosely et al does not disclose judging whether the coordinates are within the specified range when the single event is

Application No. 09/749,084
Response to Final Office Action

Customer No. 01933

performed, Mosely et al also clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest transferring data within the specified range of the operation target to a transfer destination when the coordinates are judged to be within the specified range.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Mosely et al does not disclose, teach or suggest the features recited in claim 21, and the corresponding features recited in claims 30, 37 and 39, whereby it is judged whether coordinates of an input pointer of the input device, when the single event is performed, are within the specified range of the operation target; and whereby data within the specified range of the operation target is transferred to a transfer destination when the coordinates are judged to be within the specified range.

Finally, it is also respectfully submitted that none of the other cited references disclose, teach or suggest the above described features of the claimed present invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 21, 30, 37 and 39, as well as claims 22-29 and 30-36 respectively depending therefrom, all patentably distinguish over Moseley et al, taken singly or in combination with any of the other cited references, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103.

* * * * *


Application No. 09/749,084
Response to Final Office Action

Customer No. 01933

In view of the foregoing, entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,


Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
767 Third Avenue - 25th Floor
New York, New York 10017-2023
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:iv
encs.